AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the original sheet of drawings by the replacement sheet which is submitted with this paper, on which labels have been explicated based on the corresponding description. No new matter has been added.

REMARKS

By the present amendment, the specification has been amended to insert section subtitles and the abstract has been amended to avoid legal phraseology.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "means for detecting a ~~state~~ stage in which the vehicle accelerator pedal is being raised ~~or~~ and for detecting a stage in which the vehicle engine is idling, and to change "and/or" to "and" in the last clause.

New method claims 8-14 corresponding to system claims 1-7 have been added.

The present application is a national stage of a PCT application, so that "unity of invention" rules apply. Here, the system and method claims have a common special technical feature under "unity of invention" rules. Accordingly, it is submitted that system and method claims should be examined together in this application.

Claims 1-14 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 8 are the only independent claims.

I. Objection to the drawings

In the Office Action, the drawings are objected to as lacking labels for the items referenced in Figures 1 and 2.

The original sheet of drawings has been replaced by a replacement sheet on which labels have been explicated based on the corresponding description. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, it is submitted that the objection should be withdrawn.

II. Objection to the specification

In the Office Action, the specification is objected to as lacking section subtitles.

The specification has been amended to insert section subtitles. Accordingly, it is submitted that the objection should be withdrawn.

III. Double patenting rejection

In the Office Action, claim 1-7 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, as obvious over claims 1-7 of co-pending U.S. Application No. 10/595,635 by Christophe Colignon.

Terminal Disclaimers with respect to U.S. Appl. No. 10/595,635 by Christophe Colignon and U.S. Appl. No. 10/595,624, also by Christophe Colignon, are submitted with this paper. Accordingly, it is submitted that the provisional rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Art rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as anticipated by US 6,598,387 to Carberry et al. ("Carberry").

Further, claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Carberry in view of US 4,655,037 to Rao ("Rao").

The rejections are respectfully traversed. In Carberry, the temperature increase is mainly carried out by throttling the engine intake, and hence enriching the exhaust gas (by increasing the ratio fuel/air). As mentioned in Carberry claim 4, further action may include triggering post-injections (see, e.g., Carberry at col. 3, line 59 to col. 4, line 5 and claim 4).

Thus, in Carberry, far from being interrupted or reduced, post-injections may be triggered at any time during any period of idling when the exhaust temperature goes under a given threshold and it is not interrupted or reduced after a predetermined maximum duration of application.

As a result, the system of Carberry is completely different from the system of the presently claimed invention which includes in particular the immediate interruption of the or each post-injection if the duration of post-injection utilization reaches the predetermined maximum duration of application during a stage of returning to idling, and the progressive reduction of the or each post-injection when the duration of post-injection utilization reaches the predetermined maximum duration of application during a stage of the engine idling, as recited in present claim 1.

Further, with respect to the dependent claims, it is submitted that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the combined features of each of these claims. Therefore, each of these respective claims is not obvious over the cited references taken alone or in any combination.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 502759.

Respectfully submitted,

/nicolas seckel/

Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,373

Nicolas E. Seckel
Patent Attorney
1250 Connecticut Avenue, NW Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202-669-5169
Fax: 202-822-1257
Customer No.: 29980
NES/rep